

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended. No new matter has been presented.

Applicant requests that amendments to the claims be entered in this after-final Amendment because they are merely directed to form and do not require any further search and/or consideration.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully overcome in view of the foregoing claim amendments. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully overcome in part and traversed in part.

Claim 1 has been amended to correct the problems noted by the Examiner in this rejection. However, the rejection with respect to claim 6 is traversed as follows.

First, the Examiner notes that the recitation of “a server” in line and the recitation of a “telecommunications service server” in line 8 are inconsistent. However, as seen in Fig. 1 and the corresponding description in the specification beginning at pg. 10, line 17, there is a server that is located within the switching center (see element 8) that is in addition to the telecommunications service server (see element 9 in Fig. 1). These are different devices and have different names. Correction of this claim limitation should not be required.

The Examiner also notes that claim 6 recites “the Internet” which the Examiner says has not antecedent basis. However, claim 6 actually recites “an Internet” not “the Internet.” Claim 1 previously recited “an Internet” but this has been corrected.

Finally, the Examiner asserts that the recitation “received signaling information” in line 6 lacks antecedent basis because it is preceded by the same limitation in line 4. Applicant does not understand this rejection. Claim 6 recites that the controller receives signaling information and then

recites that a device within the controller converts the received signaling information. Essentially, this claim recites that the controller receives the signaling information and then converts the received information. Applicant fails to see why gives rise to a 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejection and requests that this rejection be withdrawn or explained more fully.

In accordance with the foregoing, applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2 and 6-9 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja, U.S. Patent No. 6,222,837, in view of Brand, U.S. Patent No. 6,810,034 and further in view of Zinda, U.S. Patent 6,393,437. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner admits that Ahuja fails to teach converting the signaling information in the switching center to at least one message which is transmitted to at least one telecommunications service server or that the at least one telecommunication service server carries out telecommunications services which correspond to the at least one message, but asserts that these features are taught by Brand and that it would have been obvious to have modified Ahuja in view of Brand to provide a voice communication link with the recipient party.

Brand discloses a method which allows a calling party to transmit a message to a telephone belonging to a recipient party where the message is transmitted via an IP network. Applicant submits that neither Ahuja nor Brand teaches the features of converting the signaling information in the switching center to at least one message which is transmitted to at least one telecommunications service server or that the at least one telecommunication service server carries out telecommunications services which correspond to the at least one message.

Brand teaches that a calling party transmits a message to a telephone belonging to a recipient party where the message is transmitted via an Internet Protocol network (abstract). Brand discloses that the message delivered from the calling party to the recipient party includes voice messages, audible messages containing data, and the like (col. 4, lines 64-65). However, Brand never discloses any situation in which any device in the disclosed system carries out telecommunication services which correspond to the at least one message. Brand merely discloses a

system whereby people can communicate with their telephones over the Internet. This does not relate in any way to the claimed invention. Zinda likewise fails to teach or suggest the features of claim 1. Thus, the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, the features of claim 1.

Claims 2-5 are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies.

Claim 6 recites "the controller having a device to convert received signaling information, which relates at least to one telecommunications service, into messages, and having an interface to connect at least one telecommunications service server to the switching center."

The Examiner again relies on Brand as teaching this feature. However, Brand teaches transmitting messages between a calling party and a recipient party and does not convert received signaling information which relates to a telecommunications service into a message. Brand merely transmits a message such as a voicemail message. Again, Brand does not relate in any way to the claimed invention.

The remaining claims are allowable at least due to their respective dependencies. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahuja in view of Brand and further in view of Zinda. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, Brand and Ahuja fail to teach or suggest the features of the independent claims. Since claim 3 depends from claim 1, and further since Zinda fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ahuja and Brand, claim 3 is also allowable. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is

determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 44912-2021400.

Dated: January 16, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7753